

We conclude that Detective Lillienfeld’s testimony at defendant’s preliminary examination as to Canela’s statements was admissible under *Whitman, supra*, 54 Cal.3d 1063, and Proposition 115. The decision of the Court of Appeal so holding is affirmed.

George, C.J.
Mosk, J.
Kennard, J.
Baxter, J.
Werdegar, J.
Brown, J.

The time for granting or denying review in the above cause is hereby extended to and including July 18, 2000, or the date upon which review is either granted or denied.

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opening brief is extended to and including August 4, 2000.

S022224 People, Respondent

v.

Darren Cornelius Stanley, Appellant

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's reply brief is extended to and including August 15, 2000.

S024599 People, Respondent

v.

Michael Lamont Jones, Appellant

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's reply brief is extended to and including August 11, 2000.

No further extensions of time are contemplated.

S084057 Certain Underwriters at Lloyd's of London et al., Petitioners

v.

Los Angeles County Superior Court, Respondent

Powerine Oil Company et al., Real Parties in Interest

The application of AstraZeneca et al. for permission to file an amicus curiae brief in support of real party in interest is hereby granted.

An answer thereto may be served and filed by any party within twenty days of the filing of the brief.

S084057 Certain Underwriters at Lloyd's of London et al., Petitioners

v.

Los Angeles County Superior Court, Respondent

Powerine Oil Company et al., Real Parties in Interest

The application of Weir Floway, Inc. for permission to file an amicus curiae brief in support of real party in interest Powerine Oil Company herein is hereby granted.

The brief shall be served and filed within twenty days of the filing of the brief.

S030956 People, Respondent

v.

William James Ramos, Appellant

Appellant's application for leave to file appellant's opening brief in excess of 280 pages is granted.

S089079 Qasyca Jalil Amura, Petitioner

v.

San Diego County Superior Court, Respondent

People, Real Party in Interest

The above-entitled matter is transferred to the Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, for consideration in light of *Hagan v. Superior Court* (1962) 57 Cal.2d 767. In the event the Court of Appeal determines that this petition is substantially identical to a prior petition, the repetitious petition shall be denied.

S020161 People, Respondent

v.

Tauno Waidla, Appellant

In the above-entitled matter, the Court filed its decision on April 6, 2000, because of the following extraordinary and compelling circumstances:

1. The size of the record on appeal.
2. The necessity to grant appellant, for good cause, several extensions of time within which to submit his briefs.
3. The necessity to grant respondent, for good cause, several extensions of time within which to submit their briefs.
4. The number and complexity of the issues raised on appeal and the extensiveness of the briefing of the parties.
5. The submission by appellant of a petition for writ of habeas corpus in connection with the appeal. (In re Tauno Waidla on Habeas Corpus, S076438.)
6. The number and complexity of the issues raised on habeas corpus.
7. The divergent viewpoints of the justices.

